

East Alaska Resource Management Plan

[| Glennallen Home Page |](#) [| News |](#) [| Information |](#) [| EARMP Index |](#) [| Sitemap |](#) [| Alaska BLM Home |](#)

EAST ALASKA RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN SCOPING REPORT

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Overview/Purpose and Need for the East Alaska RMP

The Glennallen Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) is preparing an East Alaska Resource Management Plan (EARMP) to provide a comprehensive framework for managing and allocating uses of the public lands and resources within the Glennallen District. This planning process will meet the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) through a detailed description of the alternatives and environmental consequences resulting from each alternative. Currently, a Management Framework Plan (MFP) completed in 1980, and amended in 1982, guides the use of these lands. An evaluation of the MFP was conducted in 2003 which indicated the need for a new Resource Management Plan (RMP) to respond to increasing tourism and recreational use in the area, and new issues that have developed since 1982. The RMP will resolve resource management issues not adequately addressed by the MFP and provide direction for site-specific activity planning and implementation of specific tasks in the future. Ultimately, an approved RMP will supersede the existing Management Framework Plan.

In 1991, a draft Resource Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement for the Southcentral Planning Area was completed. This draft RMP/EIS was never released, reviewed by the public, or implemented. An Alaska State Office and Glennallen Field Office team evaluated the draft RMP in December 2001 and January 2002. Some of the materials used in the earlier process remain valuable and will be used to develop a new East Alaska RMP.

The Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA), as amended, provides the authority for the Bureau of Land Management land use planning on public lands. In particular, Sec. 202 (a) requires the Secretary of the Interior, with public involvement, to develop, maintain, and when appropriate, revise land use plans that provide by tracts or areas for the use of the public lands. Implementing regulations are contained in the Code of Federal Regulations, 43 CFR 1610. BLM Manual, 1601 Land Use Planning, and a handbook (H-1601-1 Land Use Planning Handbook), provide procedures and guidance for the planning process.

B. Description of the Planning Area

The East Alaska planning area encompasses approximately 7.6 million acres of BLM-administered lands in the Glennallen District in eastern Alaska. See attached map. These lands lie from the southern slopes of the Alaska Range to the Chugach Mountains, from the Talkeetna Mountains to the Wrangell Mountains, and include an extensive area of coastline in Prince William Sound. The area is bisected by the Glenn and Richardson Highways and the Denali

Highway, and is accessible by Alaska standards. The area is also bisected by the Trans-Alaska pipeline, which runs from the north to the south, and roughly parallels the Richardson Highway. The planning area includes lands administered by other federal agencies, such as the National Park Service (NPS) and the Forest Service (FS), as well as lands conveyed to the State, Native corporations, or other private landowners. Also it includes lands selected, but not yet conveyed, to the State of Alaska and Native Corporations and villages. Table 1 shows the ownership and land status within the planning area.

Table 1
Land Status Within the East Alaska Planning Area

Land Category	Acres	Total Acres
BLM Administered Lands		
BLM Public Lands	3,270,300	
State Selected (BLM)	2,013,600	
ANSCA Selected (BLM)	516,500	
State & ANSCA Selected	1,795,700	
Military	2,500	
Total		7,598,600
NPS Administered Lands		
NPS Lands	11,630,100	
ANSCA Selected (NPS)	800,200	
State Selected (NPS)	5,900	
Total		12,436,200
State of Alaska Administered Lands		
State Lands	5,176,500	
Total		5,176,500
Forest Service Administered		
Forest Service Lands	1,891,300	
ANSCA Selected (FS)	342,900	
Total		2,234,200
ANSCA Owned		2,036,000
Private		64,400
Total Lands Within Planning Area		29,546,000

C. Description of the Scoping Process

Notice of Intent for the East Alaska Resource Management Plan was published in the Federal Register on March 18, 2003.

Public scoping began in mid-February, 2003 and extended to mid-June, 2003. A total of 30

public meetings were held, mostly within the Copper Basin. The meetings were widespread and focused on scattered small communities and villages within the planning area. Meetings were also held at the larger towns/cities of Fairbanks, Anchorage, Valdez, and Cordova.

In most locations, two meetings were held. The purpose of the first meeting was to introduce the participants to the East Alaska Resource Management Plan: Why we are doing it, where it covers, what it will do, and specific examples of decisions that might come out of the plan. A detailed land status map was also available for review. Then participants were split into groups and went through an issue generating exercise. The first meeting ended with a list of issues/concerns/questions regarding BLM-managed lands. The second meeting summarized the issues/concerns/questions identified at the first meeting and explained each relative to how (or if) it would be covered in the RMP. More detailed planning unit maps were available for review and participants were given a questionnaire that had them identify desired conditions by resource area (wildlife, recreation, minerals, Off-Road Vehicle management, etc.). In some locations (Fairbanks, Anchorage, Cordova, Cantwell, Valdez, and Delta Junction) only one meeting was held, due to travel time from Glennallen.

Concurrent with the meetings, an East Alaska Resource Management Plan website was developed. The website contained a public meeting schedule and a detailed explanation of the RMP process. As the first round of meetings was completed, meeting notes and a summary of the issues/concerns/questions raised were listed on the website. The second meeting notes will also be posted on the website. At the end of the scoping period, a summary of public issues will be posted on the website and sent out via a newsletter to all those who participated in the public meetings. In addition, written comments were received during the scoping period of March 18-June 18, 2003.

D. Cooperating Agencies/invitees

Just after publication of the Notice of Intent, a cooperator's letter was sent out to agencies/Native corporations within the area. The letter explained the RMP process, stressed the need for cooperation/consultation, and invited participation. Letters were sent to the following agencies/Native Corporations:

- State of Alaska
- U.S. Forest Service, Chugach National Forest
- U.S.D.A., Natural Resource Conservation Service, Alaska State Office
- National Park Service, Wrangell/St. Elias National Park and Denali National Park
- Ahtna Native Corporation
- Chugach Alaska Corporation
- Copper Valley Economic Development Council

In addition, a letter was sent from the BLM State office in May of 2002, inviting the State of Alaska to participate in the process as a cooperator, and they have that status. A joint BLM-State position has been created, with that person acting as liaison between State of Alaska and BLM in this planning process and in the Ring Of Fire RMP. So far, information has been exchanged and a meeting was held on May 16, 2003 between BLM Glennallen Field Office and State of Alaska to develop a strategy for cooperation/consultation throughout the planning process.

E. Collaboration with tribes

As mentioned above, a letter was sent to Ahtna Native Corporation extending the invitation to participate as a cooperator in the planning process. In addition, an invitation has been extended to all village councils within Ahtna Native Corporation and to the Eyak Village Council within the Chugach Native Corporation to meet and discuss issues/concerns with BLM-managed lands. We have done this so far with Cheesh-‘Na Tribe, Gakona Village council, Tazlina village council, Gulkana village council, and Eyak village council. These meetings will continue. They take the same form as our public meetings, with an explanation of the planning process followed by identification of issues/concerns and follow-up. As a result of these meetings, we have initiated a contract to have a cultural anthropologist work with the village councils and elders to identify cultural, traditional, and subsistence sites or areas important for maintenance/protection.

In addition, we have met with Ahtna Native Corporation personnel to strategize coordination/consultation and presented the RMP process to a Secession Village Organization meeting attended by 30-40 representatives from village entities within the Ahtna Native Corporation.

II. ISSUE SUMMARY

A. Summary of Public Comments and Issues Identified during scoping.

Appendix A displays public comments/concerns/questions brought out during the public meetings and afterwards in written comments. Following is a summary broken out by resource area.

- **Off-Road Vehicle/Trail management:** Aside from recreation, trails are an important means locally for subsistence and other activities. Opinions vary widely on this issue, with an equal division between those who would prefer no regulation/restrictions, to those who recognize resource impacts and see the need for some restrictions on trails. Most see the need for some “hardening” or maintenance of trails, but balanced with the desire to not encourage or increase use on the trail. Some discussion and recognition of opportunities for increased education regarding trails (marking of trails, trailhead signs, interpretive work at trailheads regarding land status, etc.). There is also a growing demand for non-motorized trail opportunities.
- **Recreation:** Another important issue in the area, with the bulk of the comments focusing on the need for recreational cabins, on Gulkana River issues, and on the need for providing/maintaining a diversity of recreational experiences, including non-motorized. There were several comments regarding the need for increased developed facilities to handle increasing visitor demands in certain areas (Denali Highway). There were also comments directed at a need for maintaining primitive recreation experiences by limiting certain activities or not promoting an area.
- **Access:** Concerns over maintaining/improving access for different activities dominated this topic, followed closely by concerns over trespass on Native land from 17(b) easements and management of 17(b)s in general.
- **Planning:** “Manage for multiple use” and “Need better maps” were the two most common themes within this topic. Better maps will not be a topic addressed by the RMP, but will be a by-product of analysis during the planning process.
- **Wildlife/Fisheries:** Many comments/concerns (predator control, hunting regulations) were outside the scope of the RMP. Those that were not focused on need for protection of critical wildlife/fisheries habitat, with fisheries concerns focused on the Copper River watershed.
- **Lands:** Comments were scattered over several areas of concern, some outside of the scope

- of the RMP (such as “speed up conveyances”). Several comments asked for consideration of making more land available for disposal for settlement. One common thread is the sense of confusion that exists over land status on the ground. People have a hard time knowing where they are and who owns/manages what. Add to that different sets of regulations for different activities for different managing entities, and it becomes a confusing mix. Better maps and education regarding this concern were encouraged.
- **Subsistence:** Most comments focused on the need for better marking on the ground for the federal subsistence hunting areas. Otherwise, in general, the non-Native community wants continued access/opportunities for subsistence hunting, while the Native community has concerns over impacts to subsistence activities, mostly related to increased recreational/sport hunting and fishing activities.
 - **Vegetation:** Comments focused on the need for fuels reduction, particularly in the Tielke area. Other comments were related to continued opportunities for firewood gathering and the need for prescribed burning to improve wildlife habitat.
 - **Commercial activities:** Most of these comments were related to heli-skiing in the Thompson pass area.
 - **Minerals:** Comments were scattered and widely varied on this topic, and most comments were written or received via e-mail.
 - **Special Designations:** Wilderness was debated, with an equal number of pros and cons. Few comments on Wild and Scenic Rivers. The Bering Glacier was mentioned a few times relative to some sort of special designation (Research Natural Area).
 - **Cultural Resources:** Comments were related to more protection for the Tangle Lakes Archaeological District (from recreation impacts and potential mineral development).

B. Anticipated Decisions to be Made

The following describes the decisions that will come out of the RMP relative to the resource area:

- **Off Road Vehicle/Trail Management:** A designation of “open, limited, or closed” to ORVs, by area, will be made.
- **Recreation:** The RMP will determine Recreation Opportunity Spectrum classes and enable us to describe (by area) what recreation experience currently exists and what recreation experience we wish to manage for in the future.
- **Access:** RMP will determine what needs exist for acquisition, termination, or re-location of 17(b) and other easements for access to public lands. Ultimately, this RMP will need to develop a strategy for management of 17(b) easements, in cooperation with Native entities and the State of Alaska.
- **Wildlife/Fisheries:** Acknowledging the States’ role in managing fish and wildlife and working in close coordination with Alaska Department of Fish and Game, describe existing and desired population and habitat conditions for major habitat types that support a wide variety of game and nongame species. Identify actions and areawide use restrictions needed to achieve desired population and habitat conditions while maintaining a thriving natural ecological balance and multiple-use relationships.
- **Lands:** Lands and Realty: Identify lands that are available for disposal provided they meet the criteria provided in FLPMA (Section 203 and 206) or other statutes and regulations. Identify criteria under which acquisitions of land would occur. Identify proposed withdrawal areas or those areas where existing withdrawals may be revoked. Identify where and under what circumstances land use authorizations such as major leases and land use permits may be granted.
- **Subsistence:** The RMP will consider impacts to subsistence opportunities and access to

opportunities from proposed actions and alternatives.

- **Vegetation:** Identify desired future conditions for vegetative resources, including the desired mix of vegetative types, structural stages, and landscape and riparian functions, and provide for native plant, fish, and wildlife habitats. Identify the actions and areawide use restrictions needed to achieve desired vegetative conditions.
- **Commercial activities:** The RMP will assist in determining appropriate levels of commercial activities in subsequent site-specific implementation decisions.
- **Minerals:** Fluid minerals (Oil and Gas, Geothermal Resources, and Coal Bed Methane): Identify areas open to leasing, subject to the terms and conditions of the standard lease form. Identify areas open to leasing, subject to major constraints such as no surface occupancy stipulations. Identify areas closed to leasing.
- **Locatable Minerals:** Identify areas open or closed to the operation of the mining laws, mineral material disposal, and nonenergy leasing. In open areas, identify any areawide terms, conditions, or other special considerations needed to protect resource values.
- **Special Designations:** Consistent with the goals, standards and objectives for the planning area, make the following determinations: Designate Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) and identify goals, standards, and objectives for each area, as well as general management practices and uses, including necessary constraints and mitigation measures. Designate Research Natural Areas and Outstanding Natural Areas as types of ACECs using the ACEC designation process.

C. Issues Raised that won't be Addressed

The following provides a discussion on this topic relative to each resource area:

- **Lands:** The RMP will not speed up or effect conveyance. It will not effect Native allotment administration. It will not address specific problems in the Slana area, such as the perceived need for surveys, access problems to homesites, and need for powerlines
- **Recreation:** The current implementation-level planning effort for the Gulkana was discussed a lot and how it will address many of the Gulkana-related concerns.
- **Trails/ORVs:** It was explained that the RMP will not schedule or determine trail-specific maintenance.
- **Commercial activities:** Most comments were specific to heli-skiing. The RMP will not determine a carrying capacity for that activity but will lay the groundwork to do so. The RMP will not change SRP administration (applications, requirements, fee collection, etc.).
- **Subsistence:** The RMP will not change administration of the federal subsistence hunting areas. The RMP will consider impacts to subsistence activities or access to them from proposed actions or alternatives considered.
- **Wildlife/Fisheries:** We continually emphasized that ADF&G manages wildlife/fisheries populations, BLM manages habitat. The RMP will not effect hunting or fishing regulations or predator control.
- **Planning:** The RMP will not address the need for better maps available to the public, but better maps will be a by-product of the planning process.
- **Other:** The RMP will not address Trans-Alaska pipeline issues.

D. Special Designations, Including Nominations

Under direction of the Secretary of Interior, wilderness inventory/assessment and nominations for specific areas to be included in the Wilderness system will not be conducted in this planning

process. Wild and Scenic River assessment will be conducted. Several comments received during scoping recognized the need for critical habitat protection, and the potential for several ACECs exist. The Bering Glacier was mentioned specifically as a candidate for wilderness or Research Natural Area designation.

V. DRAFT PLANNING CRITERIA

The following was developed as part of the Preparation Plan:

- Opportunities for public participation will be encouraged throughout the RMP process.
- Actions and activities that are potentially adverse to the existing Trans Alaska Pipeline energy right-of-way will be avoided.
- Valid existing rights will be recognized and protected.
- Subsistence uses and needs will be considered and adverse impacts will be minimized whenever possible in accordance with Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA) Sec. 810.
- The Planning Team will work cooperatively with the State of Alaska, Native corporations, municipal governments, other Federal agencies, interested groups, and individuals.
- Wildlife habitat management will be consistent with Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADFG) objectives.
- The plan will be compatible with the Gulkana and Delta River National Wild and Scenic River management plans.
- The plan will use existing data, information, plans, and land use analyses. Some additional fieldwork and assessment will be needed.
- The plan will be consistent with the mandates of FLPMA, NEPA, CEQ (Council on Environmental Quality), National Historic Preservation Act, the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, and other federal laws, regulations, and policies as required. The planning process will include an Environmental Impact Statement that will comply with National Environmental Policy Act standards.
- BLM will meet the requirements in Section 810 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA).
- ORV designations for all public lands within the planning area will be completed in accordance with 43 CFR 8342.
- Areas proposed as ACECs will meet the criteria contained in 43 CFR 1610.7-2.
- Review and classification of waterways as eligible for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System will follow the criteria contained in 43 CFR 8351.
- The plan will address all lands within the Glennallen District that are currently administered by BLM.

These preliminary planning criteria are subject to change based on comments from the State of Alaska and Native Corporations and public comments.

XV. DATA SUMMARY/DATA GAPS

Data needs are identified in the Preparation Plan for the East Alaska RMP, available on request from Bruce Rogers at the Glennallen Field Office.

Data provided during scoping included land status maps with a topographic background for the planning area as well as more detailed land status maps for each planning unit within the planning area.

Other data shown on these maps included:

- Current mining claims.
- Highways and roads.
- Trails currently in our data base.
- RS-2477 trails as shown in the State of Alaska data base.
- Administrative boundaries such as Wild & Scenic Rivers and Tangle Lakes Archeological District.

XVI. SUMMARY OF FUTURE STEPS IN THE PLANNING PROCESS

The following steps follow public scoping and involvement:

1. Assess information. Assessment is the process of synthesizing, analyzing, and interpreting data. In this case, conclusions drawn from assessments facilitate informed decision making. Our Geographic Information System (GIS) will be used for data storage, analysis, and display. The data as well as input from the public will be used to develop the next two steps. This step is already happening but will continue throughout this winter, summer and fall of 2003.
2. Identify desired outcomes. In this step desired outcomes (goals, standards, objectives) are developed to address identified issues. Information from steps one and two are used in this step. If there are issues or concerns regarding appropriate outcomes, a range of desired outcomes may be evaluated as alternatives in the planning process to determine the most appropriate outcomes to select as planning decisions. Step number 3 is tentatively scheduled for fall/winter 2003/2004
3. Identify allowable uses and actions to achieve desired outcomes. When accomplishing this step, we will consider resource development potential, levels of use, and restrictions to best achieve goals, standards, and objectives. These uses and restrictions are based on resource protection needs and social and economic factors, and represent the most appropriate mix of uses for the land. Different protection and restoration measures and the availability of areas for certain uses, levels of uses, and restrictions are presented as alternatives in the land use plan and are evaluated in the associated NEPA document. This step will occur concurrent with Step number 3 and will involve another round of public participation (to review alternatives)
4. NEPA analysis. The alternative that meets statutory requirements, best achieves the goals and policies of BLM as reflected through BLM's Strategic Plan and State Director guidance, and best resolves the issues pertinent to the planning effort should be identified as the preferred alternative or proposed plan. This preferred alternative will be analyzed in an Environmental Impact Statement. A draft EIS will be written in spring/summer of 2004, with a final scheduled to come out in 2005.

Coordination and consultation with the State of Alaska and Native Corporations and villages will continue concurrent with all of the steps listed above. Step #3 will include another opportunity for public participation with review of alternatives, tentatively scheduled for winter/spring 2003/2004.

APPENDIX A SUMMARY OF ISSUES/COMMENTS EARMP, PUBLIC MEETINGS AND WRITTEN COMMENTS

- I. Introduction:** As part of the scoping process for the East Alaska Resource Management Plan (EARMP), 30 public meetings were held, mostly focusing on the Copper Basin. At the meetings,

participants were able to identify issues/concerns/questions regarding BLM-managed lands. Issues were discussed at a second meeting relative to how (or if) they would be covered by the RMP. Summarized below are issues/concerns grouped by broad resource category. Numbers in parenthesis simply note the number of times that issue/concern was brought up throughout the course of the meetings and in written comments, not necessarily the number of individuals expressing the concern. This summary documents the comments recorded in meetings as well as written comments/questionnaires received.

II. Issues/Concerns Grouped by Resource Area

A. Lands (17)

- Is it possible to lease a cabin or cabin site? (1)
- Need to speed up the conveyance process (2)
- Some lands should be available for disposal (settlement) (4)
- What is the potential for agricultural or waste disposal leases? (1)
- Native allotment concerns (2)
- Relinquish State selections in the Denali highway area (1)
- Powerline in Slana area (1)
- Access problems in Slana (to homesites) (1)
- Surveys needed in Slana (1)
- Retain pipeline ROW lands as public lands, managed for multiple use (2)
- Retain rivers in public ownership when surrounding lands are conveyed (1)

L. Recreation (46)

- Need cabins for recreational and safety purposes (5)
- Negative impacts from recreational activities and fishing on Gulkana River (5)
- Keep rivers “pristine”, with little motorized use (2)
- Denali Highway needs more developed recreation facilities (2)
- Concern about recreation impacts in Denali highway area (1)
- Manage for a diversity of experiences, specifically primitive, quiet, and non-motorized (19)
- Overcrowding leading to conflicting uses (2)
- Manage flight seeing and heli-skiing to protect other resources (4)
- Uses should be limited in certain areas to protect recreation experience (2)
- Maintain wilderness (primitive) qualities (4)

K. Vegetation (43)

- Need fuels reduction in Tiekela area (1)
- Wildfires should be allowed to burn, except to protect structures (2)
- Need fuels reduction projects in general (7)
- Concerned about impacts of road construction (related to logging) (1)
- Need to scientifically assess fire hazard from beetle-kill spruce (1)
- Logging shouldn't conflict with existing uses (2)
- Prescribed fire needed to improve habitat (5)
- Designate areas for firewood, houselog gathering (1)
- Need continued opportunities for firewood (5)

- Need continued opportunities/habitat for berry-picking (4)
- Leave it alone (2)
- Manage for local subsistence use, not commercial (1)
- Vegetation is damaged by ORVs (5)
- Manage for optimum habitat for widest variety of species (2)
- Protect it (2)
- Herbicides should not be used in vegetation management (2)

Q. ORV/Trail Management (90)

- Trails should be kept open and unregulated (7)
- Resource impacts are occurring from ORV use (15)
- Trails are not managed, need maintenance (10)
- Need trail maps, better marking (4)
- Trails are important for access to different activities (2)
- Need more education on trail ethics, land status, etc. (2)
- BLM lands should be closed to ORV use until specifically opened (2)
- Some limitations/designations needed (21)
- Some limitations/designations needed on winter trails (2)
- ORVs need to be managed considering State and Native management cumulatively (2)
- Spread out ORV use to decrease impacts (2)
- Jetskis, airboats, and hovercraft should not be allowed (2)
- Do not harden trails (2)
- Need to provide for diversity of trail opportunities, including non-motorized (6)
- Include airplanes, boats, and bicycles as ORVs (1)
- Do not mark some trailheads (2)
- Need enforcement of existing regulations (1)
- Need to monitor ORV impacts (2)
- Eureka area is example of how not to manage ORVs (1)
- Decibel requirements needed for ORVs (1)
- ORVs need to meet pollution standards (1)
- Work cooperatively with local groups on maintenance, construction (2)

W. Special Designations (21)

- Need wilderness assessment/areas (5)
- Heli-skiing negatively effects potential for future wilderness designation (1)
- No more wilderness (1)
- No more special designations of any kind (4)
- Bering Glacier should be designated wilderness (1)
- Bering Glacier needs a special designation (1)
- Bering Glacier should be managed as Research Natural Area (1)
- Manage Denali Highway area as Special Recreation Management Area (1)
- Manage Denali Highway area (area south of highway) as ACEC (2)
- Manage federal subsistence hunting areas as Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs) (1)
- Manage all BLM lands as ACEC (1)
- Manage Tonsina River as Wild and Scenic River (1)

- Lands above 2,000 feet between Copper River and Richardson Highway, and Tiekell River and Little Tonsina Rivers, manage as ACEC, close to motorized use for protection of goats, sheep, denning bears, other wildlife (1)

N. Commercial Activities (8)

- Heli-skiing creates conflict with non-motorized users (2)
- Need to monitor commercial activities (2)
- Concerns about commercial berry-picking along Denali highway (1)
- Commercial operators need stability in permitting process (1)
- Planning necessary to establish carrying capacities for commercial operations (1)
- Need opportunities for leasing in connection with commercial operations (1)

G. Access (easements) (32)

- Easements not marked, confusing (1)
- 17(b) trespass concerns (5)
- Impacts to easements occurring from ORVs, increased use (2)
- Use conflicts occurring (1)
- 17(b) vs. RS-2477, which takes precedence? (1)
- BLM should establish criteria, conduct environmental reviews, and provide for public comment before granting any RS-2477 route (2)
- Not enough access (9)
- Need to maintain access (3)
- Need access to mining claims (1)
- Will RS-2477 routes provide access? (1)
- Limit access to prevent overuse (1)
- Display all 17(b) easements in plan (5)

M. Subsistence (18)

- State-selected lands need to be opened to federal subsistence hunting (2)
- Federal subsistence hunting areas need better marking and maps (5)
- Maintain subsistence opportunities (3)
- Concern about increasing recreation, sport-hunting/fishing impacts on subsistence activities (3)
- Concern about potential road construction and impacts on subsistence activities (1)v
- Educate federal subsistence hunters about ethics (1)
- Subsistence uses should have highest priority in multiple use (2)
- Trails should be designated in federal subsistence hunting areas (1)

I. Socio-Economic (10)

- Sustain local eco-tourism business opportunities (1)
- Responsible, sustainable resource development needed (2)
- Mining important to local economy (5)

- Non-motorized recreation can present economic opportunities (2)

E. Wildlife/Fisheries (31)

- Overhunting occurring in certain areas (Nelchina caribou herd and Chitina sheep hunting specifically mentioned) (5)
- Not enough enforcement (2)
- Hunting regulations confusing (2)
- Copper River needs to be designated as a wild salmon preserve (1)
- Need predator control (4)
- More federal/State cooperation needed in wildlife/fisheries management and research (2)
- Consider salmon stream protection (1)
- Protection needed for critical wildlife/fisheries habitat (2)
- Protection needed for non-anadromous as well as anadromous fish habitat (1)
- BLM needs to protect habitat for all species (1)
- Close critical habitat areas to ORV use (4)
- Need more trapping, hunting, fishing (1)
- Fishwheels operated improperly (1)
- Concerned about effects of potential large fire on fisheries (1)
- Some trails should be trap-free to allow recreation with dogs (2)
- Concerned about communication tower impacts on birds (1)

F. Minerals (49)

- More mineral exploration, development (8)
- BLM should place low emphasis on mineral exploration/development, given high emphasis on State lands (2)
- Need to consider impacts of mineral exploration/development on resources (1)
- Protection of aquifer quality should be a requirement for gas drilling and mining (1)
- Need more gravel (2)
- Need good reclamation, concerns over abandoned mines (2)
- No mineral development in Denali block (2)
- Don't make lands available to mineral exploration/development because of adverse impacts to other resources (7)
- Prices too low to encourage development (1)
- Withdrawal review needed to consider more lands available for exploration/development (5)
- No more wilderness/W&S Rivers that "lock up" mineral opportunities (5)
- RMP should include complete mineral assessment (5)
- Include Yost trail as RS-2477 access route to mineral activity (5)
- Designate areas for recreational mining (1)
- Need citizen's advisory group for "oversight" in popular recreational areas (2)

P. Planning (29)

- Need better maps available for the public (6)
- Need to consult with Native village councils, elders (2)
- Need to manage for multiple use (9)
- Planning is a waste of time (2)

- This plan needs to consider the Copper River watershed as a whole (2)
- Manage watersheds, not straight lines (1)
- Plan needs to consider Native Corporation land use plans (1)
- Trans-Alaska pipeline concerns (oil spill contingency) (1)
- Do not promote public lands (1)
- Better communication needed (between BLM and public) (1)
- Establish citizen monitoring groups (1)
- RMP needs to consider cumulative effects of State, Native and NPS lands managed in the planning area (2)

M. Cultural Resources (2)

- Tangle Lakes Archaeological District needs more protection (2)

III. Issues/Concerns out of the scope of this planning effort.

In the second round of meetings, we reviewed issues/concerns relative to how (or if) they would be covered in the RMP. In general:

- **Lands:** The RMP will not speed up or effect conveyance. It will not effect Native allotment administration. It will not address specific problems in the Slana area, such as the perceived need for surveys, access problems to homesites, and need for powerlines.
- **Recreation:** The current planning effort for the Gulkana was discussed a lot and how it will address many of the Gulkana-related concerns.
- **Trails/ORVs:** It was explained that the RMP will not schedule or determine trail-specific maintenance.
- **Commercial activities:** Most comments were specific to heli-skiing. The RMP will not determine a carrying capacity for that activity but will lay the groundwork to do so. The RMP will not change Special Recreation Permit requirements, fee collection, or administration.
- **Subsistence:** The RMP will not change administration of the federal subsistence hunting areas. The RMP will consider impacts to subsistence activities or access to them from proposed actions or alternatives considered.
- **Wildlife/Fisheries:** We continually emphasized that ADF&G manages wildlife/fisheries populations, BLM manages habitat. The RMP will not effect hunting or fishing regulations or predator control.
- **Other:** The RMP will not address Trans-Alaska pipeline issues.

 Glennallen Home Page News Information EARMF Index Sitemap Alaska BLM Home 		
This site maintained by the webmaster , BLM, Alaska State Office, in Anchorage, Alaska.	Created: September 29, 2003 Last Updated: September 30, 2003	Please send all comments and suggestions on page content to: Bruce E. Rogers , BLM, Glennallen Field Office.
U.S. Department of the Interior Bureau of Land Management 222 West 7th Avenue, #13 Anchorage, AK 99513 (907) 271-5477		This is a U.S. Government Computer System. Before continuing, please read our disclaimer and privacy statement .